



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,420	05/10/2001	Tetsujiro Kondo	450100-03213	6765

20999 7590 06/17/2003

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

SCHNEIDER, JOSHUA D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2182

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SC

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853,420

Applicant(s)

KONDO ET AL. *SK*

Examiner

Joshua D Schneider

Art Unit

2182

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 23, 24, 25, 28, and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent 5,668,890 to Winkelman. With regards to claims 1, 14, and 15, the use of input interface means to interface with a plurality of input devices is inherent in Figure 1 (elements 1-3, connected to element 7). Winkelman teaches common processing means independent of the input device information data received (Fig. 1, elements 7 and 12, and column 2, lines 47-50), and variable processing means dependent on an input device information data received via the input device interface (Fig. 1, elements 8 and 8c, column 2, lines 52-55).
4. With regards to claims 4, 16, 23, and 24, the use of output interface means to interface with a plurality of output devices is inherent in Figure 1 (elements 4-6, connected to element 12). Winkelman teaches common processing means independent of the output device information data supplied (Fig. 1, elements 7 and 12, and column 2, lines 47-50), and variable processing means dependent on an output device information data supplied via the output device interface (Fig. 1, elements 8 and 8c, column 2, lines 52-55).

Art Unit: 2182

5. With regards to claims 8, 12, 19, 25, 28, and 29, the use of storage interface means to interface with a plurality of storage devices is inherent in Figure 1 (element 6, connected to element 12). Winkelman teaches common processing means independent of the storage device information data received or supplied (Fig. 1, elements 7 and 12, and column 2, lines 47-50), and variable processing means dependent on a storage device information data received or supplied via the storage device interface (Fig. 1, elements 8 and 8c, column 2, lines 52-55).

6. With regards to claims 3, 6, 10, 18, 21, and 27, Winkelman teaches the interface functioning as an interface with each of at least two input devices (Fig. 1, elements 1-5, connected to element 7) and output devices (Fig. 1, elements 4-6, connected to element 12)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,668,890 to Winkelman in further view of U.S. Patent 6,189,050 to Sakarda.

With regards to claims 2, 5, 9, 17, 20, and 26, Winkelman fails to explicitly teach the detection of the type of the attached devices, though it may be inherent in the connection of the different types of input and output devices, needing different types of conversion processes, as shown in Fig. 1. The detection of device type was well known in the art at the time of invention. Sakarda teaches detecting of device type in a computer processing system so that devices may be added and removed as necessary (Fig. 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2182

at the time of invention to combine the processing system of Winkelman with the device recognition of Sakarda to create a more robust processing system which can recognize input, output, and storage devices, in order to provide greater system stability and flexibility in a competitive computer market

9. Claims 7, 11, 13, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,668,890 to Winkelman. With regards to claims 7, 11, 13, and 22, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that any of an input interface, an output interface, or a storage interface could be integrated into the same interface. It is well known in the art with combination input and output devices such as scanner/printers, and with storage devices in that data is input and output from a storage device, that input, output and storage are often done through a common interface.

10. With regards to claim 27, Winkelman teaches the interface functioning as an interface with each of at least two input devices (Fig. 1, elements 1-5, connected to element 7) and output devices (Fig. 1, elements 4-6, connected to element 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that the connections to multiple input and output devices could also be to multiple storage devices, as the connection would be no different in general nature than that of the connections to any of the multiple input and output devices shown. Furthermore, the output device shown in Fig. 1, element 6, is a storage device, and multiple instances of such a device would have also been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion


11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 6,490,255 to Kiraha et al. teaches device dependent and device independent processing portions in a network management environment. U.S. Patent 6,268,939 to Klassen et al. teaches device dependent conversions and device independent processing of images. U.S. Patent 5,581,376 to Harrington teaches input and output interfaces, including network connections, in an image processing unit connected to multiple types of devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Schneider whose telephone number is (703) 305-7991. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on (703) 308-3301. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

JDS
June 13, 2003


JEFFREY GAFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100